

Report from the Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Subcommittee of the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program

April 14, 1998

Participants

Coordinator - Chris Jonientz-Trisler, FEMA

Alaska - Mike Webb

California - Lori Dengler

Hawaii - Brian Yanagi, Gus Furumoto

Oregon - Mark Darienzo, Don Hull, Angie Karel

Washington - George Crawford, Tim Walsh

Funding Status

FEMA initiated paperwork to transfer 1998 funds to States upon receipt of program funds from NOAA. States are going through the application process and funds should arrive very soon to the States.

Statements of Work for FY 98

State Activities

Only two written State reports were provided prior to this meeting so the [Tsunami Activities Matrix](#) requires another update shortly after this meeting. (Update version dated April 10, 1998 is provided for this meeting.)

What Has Changed in the States Due to the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program?

Tsunami issues are currently "on the screen" in lots of venues. A synergism of multi-state effort

exists. We know the questions to ask now and have a much better assessment of our needs.

- Alaska - Flagging interest in tsunami has been revived. Phone trees are up-to-date. Things are being incorporated. DOT is involved at a basic level. PIOs are interested in educating corporations on watch/warnings. Alaska has more community plans now.
- California - Many direct activities happened due to the earthquake activity in the Cape Mendocino area. But the Tsunami Program has significantly helped foster communication between communities on these issues, i.e., improved the tsunami mitigation infrastructure.
- Hawaii - The seismic network has been upgraded. There is increased communication between PTWC and WC/ATWC. When the deep-water buoy system is working properly, it is expected to help reduce "false" alarms for tsunamis. Public education is invigorated. PTWC injects more scientific information into projecting warnings.
- Oregon - The Program has validated the tsunami issue in Oregon. It has accelerated mapping and product development. There is a comfort level among Oregon communities that they are not isolated from neighboring states' communities as they try to reduce tsunami risk because it can be such a controversial issue within communities dealing with tourism and similar industries. Communities that formerly shunned tsunami issues are now asking for hazard and education signs. Oregon benefits from the multi-state sharing of ideas and multi-state projects. The Program seed money provides products that might not otherwise be developed, and also generates partnerships that allow for transfer of needs and ideas from the local level.
- Washington - Counties are now focused on tsunami issues and feel that it is their own project. Most coastal counties have very scarce resources and without the seed money, may be able to do nothing. No tsunami disaster plans existed a year ago, but they exist now. Counties are now asking for the State and Federal members to work with them on these issues.

Archival Issues

There is great concern about how new and existing products both internal and external to this subcommittee will be archived in an accessible way and several issues were raised.

- What is NOAA's commitment to TIME beyond current and possible future funding?
- When something in a community changes, e.g. dredging a bay, new development, how are those changes in impacts addressed?
- Is redundancy of distribution systems in States a good idea?
- How do we address the loss of key people/agencies/resource center functions?

Four types of archiving were discussed.

- The first is archiving of existing materials.
- Another is archiving of National Program products.
- Archiving for Mitigation Subcommittee' s products.
- Archiving products outside of the Program.

The archival process must allow for accessibility so that items are easily found by anyone needing them. The format must be usable by everyone, and updated on a regular basis, ideally forever.

At a minimum, we must provide an Annual Report with an appropriate format and pictures, etc. This report should include successful case studies. The audience intended to receive this report includes other States, political entities, similar issues groups such as the Hurricane Program and flash flood communities. (Further discussion of these issues occurred during the proposal section of our meeting.)

The Implementation Plan

Lori presented the Implementation Plan and emphasized that it is not specific and it is not what we must do. Rather it is a broad-spectrum framework that addresses the unique character of the States. The Subcommittee felt that the Plan is a good framework, gives direction for States, and can serve as a charter. The Subcommittee adopts the Plan with the provision that minor changes will be discussed with Lori and recommends it to the Steering Committee at this point.

Multi-state Proposals

Five multi-state projects were accepted either to fund or to gather more information on before making a decision to fund.

- The Subcommittee agrees to fund a feasibility study to look at evaluating construction and design issues in areas subjected to strong ground shaking and tsunami inundation and to include domestic and foreign information. (Cost \$20,000.)
- The Subcommittee formed a smaller group to gather more information on a proposal to create a database of tsunami hazards and mitigation citations drawn from a variety of sources and to make it available to the Pacific States and others. If the information gathered by the group is

acceptable, then the Subcommittee agrees to fund this pilot project. (Cost \$28,000.)

- The Subcommittee reviewed a video proposal which will be held for further discussion until more information is received on a video that Eddie Bernard is involved with. The Subcommittee formed a smaller group to gather information, including review comments from others and some Subcommittee members, on a proposal to support some printing costs for a book based on interviews and lessons learned from the 1960 Chilean tsunami. If the information and comments are favorable, then the Subcommittee agrees to fund this proposal. (Cost \$10,000.)
- The Subcommittee agrees to fund a proposal to provide States with mitigation products already developed and available at significant cost savings if bought in bulk. States will detail their needs to DOGAMI. (Cost \$35,000.)
- The Subcommittee formed a smaller group to work out a plan to publish an Annual Report on the Mitigation Subcommittee's activities including case studies of successful products and projects. This report should be of fine quality for distribution to include members of Congress. The plan will include a cost estimate. The Subcommittee agrees that the cost will be covered by the multi-state project fund.